

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

COREY JOHNSON.

Case No. 3:22-cv-00303-MMD-CLB

Y

Plaintiff.

ORDER

CHARLES DANIELS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

I. SUMMARY

Plaintiff Corey Johnson brings this civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered while in the custody of the Nevada Department of Corrections. (ECF No. 1-1.) On October 17, 2022, the Court ordered Johnson to update his address by November 18, 2022. (ECF No. 2.) That deadline expired without an updated address from Johnson, and his mail from the Court is being returned as undeliverable. (ECF No. 4.)

II. DISCUSSION

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. See *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order). In determining whether to dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the Court must consider: (1) the public’s

1 interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court's need to manage its docket;
 2 (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of
 3 cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. See *In re*
 4 *Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting
 5 *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130).

6 The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation
 7 and the Court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of Johnson's
 8 claims. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal
 9 because a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing
 10 a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542
 11 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of
 12 cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

13 The fifth factor requires the Court to consider whether less drastic alternatives can
 14 be used to correct the party's failure that brought about the Court's need to consider
 15 dismissal. See *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining
 16 that considering less drastic alternatives *before* the party has disobeyed a court order
 17 does not satisfy this factor); *accord Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th
 18 Cir. 2002) (explaining that “the persuasive force of” earlier Ninth Circuit cases that
 19 “implicitly accepted pursuit of less drastic alternatives prior to disobedience of the court’s
 20 order as satisfying this element[,]” *i.e.*, like the “initial granting of leave to amend coupled
 21 with the warning of dismissal for failure to comply[,]” have been “eroded” by *Yourish*).
 22 Courts “need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a
 23 case but must explore possible and meaningful alternatives.” *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779
 24 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this action cannot realistically proceed without
 25 the ability for the Court and the defendants to send Johnson case-related documents,
 26 filings, and orders, the only alternative is to enter a second order setting another deadline.
 27 But without an updated address, the likelihood that the second order would even reach
 28 Johnson is low, so issuing a second order will only delay the inevitable and further

1 squander the Court's finite resources. Setting another deadline is not a meaningful
2 alternative given these circumstances. So the fifth factor favors dismissal.

3 **III. CONCLUSION**

4 Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, the Court finds that they
5 weigh in favor of dismissal.

6 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on
7 Johnson's failure to file an updated address in compliance with the Court's October 17,
8 2022, order.

9 The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case.
10 No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case. If Johnson wishes to pursue
11 his claims, he must file a complaint in a new case and provide the Court with his current
12 address.

13 DATED THIS 22nd Day of November 2022.



14
15 MIRANDA M. DU
16 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28